

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 9, 12, 22, 27, 29-40, 42-45, and 47-49 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 9, 33, 42, and 49 have been amended. Claims 1, 9, and 33 are independent claims.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Henckel and Hutchinson

Claims 1, 9, 22, 27, 31, 33-40, 42-45, and 47-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,463,725 to Henckel et al. (hereafter “Henckel”) in view of Hutchinson et al., *Microsoft® PowerPoint® 97 for Windows®* (hereafter “Hutchinson”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In this rejection, the Examiner relies on Henckel to teach associating a navigational functionality with an interactive region and displaying another immersive reading page in response to the user selecting the interactive region. For these elements, the Examiner relies on Henckel’s teaching that a user turns the page by touching the screen with his hand or pointing device, and moving his hand/pointing device across the screen (Office Action at page 4). The Examiner admits that Henckel fails to teach that the interactive region spans only a portion of the immersive page (*id.*). Also, the Examiner admits that Henckel does not teach the feature of tapping the interactive region (*id.*). The Examiner imports the teachings of Hutchinson to remedy these deficiencies, citing Figs. 1 and 3 (*id.*). The Examiner asserts it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Hutchinson with Henckel because “[m]otivation would have been to provide a convenient GUI (Office Action at page 5).

Applicants respectfully submit that, at most, the cited figures of Hutchinson teach left and right buttons that the user must *click on* via a pointing device (mouse, etc.) in order to navigate

through PowerPoint slides. As such, the user would *click on* Hutchinson's left button in order to display the previous slide, or *click on* Hutchinson's right button in order to display the next slide.

Hutchinson Fails to Teach/Suggest Tapping

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion that Hutchinson discloses *tapping* an interactive region. As discussed above, the cited figures of Hutchinson at most suggest a user *clicking on* left and right buttons using a pointing device. It is respectfully submitted that those of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the claimed tapping is different from the clicking of a pointing device.

Although Applicants believe the rejection is deficient at least for the above reason, Applicants have further amended independent claims 1, 9, and 33 to recite "tapping the *touch-sensitive display at the* interactive region." This amendment even more clearly distinguishes the claimed tapping over the clicking operation used in Hutchinson. Since neither Henckel nor Hutchinson discloses the claimed tapping, Applicants respectfully submit that Henckel/Hutchinson fail to teach or suggest every claimed feature.

Hutchinson's Buttons are Not Transparent to User

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's proposed combination of Henckel and Hutchinson would result in Hutchinson's left and right buttons *being displayed on* Henckel's device. This would be necessary in order to allow the user to find the "interactive region" in the resultant Henckel/Hutchinson device. Accordingly, the proposed Henckel/Hutchinson combination would fail to teach or suggest that the navigational functionality associated with the interactive region is *transparent to the user prior to the tapping*, as recited in independent claims 1, 9, and 33. As such, Henckel and Hutchinson fail to teach or suggest every claimed feature for this additional reason.

Proposed Combination of Henckel/Hutchinson is Improper under § 103

Further, Applicants respectfully refer the Examiner to the following excerpt from MPEP § 2143.01:

If [a] proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. In re Gordon, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed modification by the Examiner of the Henckel in view of Hutchinson would render Henckel's invention unsatisfactory for its intended purpose and, thus, is not sanctioned by 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Applicants submit that Henckel's intended purpose is described in col. 1, lines 48-58, reproduced below:

SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

Therefore, according to the present invention, an interface for making information available to a user provides a display similar to a printed book or magazine. In order to "turn the page" of the displayed book, the user touches the screen with his hand or a pointing device, and moves it across the screen. Movement across the screen, while touching the screen, causes an animated turning of the page of the displayed printed material. This page turning technique is very similar to the turning of a page with an actual book or magazine.

This passage expressly describes that the intended purpose of Henckel's interface is to provide an interface that allows the user to turn the page of a displayed book in a manner very similar to the turning of a page with an actual book or magazine. According to the above-quoted passage, this purpose is accomplished when the user touches the screen with his hand or pointing device, and moves it across the screen. Thus, if Henckel were modified to replace this page-turning technique with Hutchinson's left and right buttons, as proposed by the Examiner, this would render Henckel's invention to be unsatisfactory for its intended purpose.

In fact, Henckel expressly *teaches away* from an interface that requires a user to “select buttons which cause pages to be turned,” because “the use of such buttons is not particularly intuitive for the unknowledgeable user” (col. 1, lines 33-35). This is further evidence that the Examiner’s proposed modification of Henckel would render it unsatisfactory for its intended purpose and is thus improper.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner’s proposed combination of Henckel and Hutchinson is not sanctioned under § 103.

Rejection should be Withdrawn

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 9, and 33 are allowable over Henckel and Hutchinson, taken separately or in combination. Further, it is respectfully submitted that claims 22, 27, 31, 34-40, 42-45, and 47-49 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1, 9, and 33. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Henckel, Hutchinson, and Ho

Claims 4, 12, 30, and 32 stand rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henckel and Hutchinson, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,407,757 to Ho (hereafter “Ho”). Applicants respectfully submit that Ho fails to remedy the deficiencies of Henckel and Hutchinson set forth above in connection with independent claims 1, 9, and 33. Further, there is no assertion by the Examiner that Ho remedies such deficiencies (Ho is only relied upon to teach invoking a training mode and providing audio indicators to teach the association). Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4, 12, 30, and 32 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 1, 9, and 33.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance in the present application.

Should the Examiner believe that any outstanding matters remain in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Jason W. Rhodes (Reg. No. 47,305) at the telephone number of the undersigned to discuss the present application in an effort to expedite prosecution.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 5, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By

for  #47,305
Michael K. Mutter

Registration No.: 29,680

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant